

REMARKS

Claims 2-18 are pending in the present application. As indicated above, Claim 1 has been cancelled without prejudice, Claims 2, 5, 6, 12, and 15 have been amended, and new Claim 18 has been added.

In the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected Claims 15-17 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,943,611 (*Molne*); Claims 1-7, 9-12 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,687,362 (*Lindquist*) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,421,707 (*Miller*); Claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lindquist* in view of *Miller* and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,516,202 (*Hawkins*); and Claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lindquist* in view of *Miller* and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0032771 (*Gledje*).

The present invention provides a convenient method of inputting information into an address book of a mobile terminal. The invention allows various types of address information to be inputted rapidly and can be utilized as an advertising tool. On page 5, lines 11-17 of the present application, an address book service number that is composed of a number from the address book management center and a characteristic number designated to each individual or company, i.e., a client, who wants the address book to be supplied is described. For example, an address book service number may be 999-1234, where 999 is the number of the address book management center and 1234 is the characteristic number designated or assigned to each client.

With regard to independent Claims 1, 7, and 10, which have been rejected as being unpatentable over *Lindquist* in view of *Miller*, the Examiner asserts that *Lindquist* teaches all the recitations of these claims, except for transmitting and storing the retrieved address book information, which is allegedly taught in *Miller*. As indicated above, Claim 1 has been cancelled without prejudice. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of Claim 1 is moot.

With regards to Claims 7 and 10, which were rejected in view of the combination of *Lindquist* and *Miller*, it is respectfully submitted that these references also fail to teach or

describe “transmitting, from the mobile communication terminal, a **characteristic number** allocated to a client who wants address book information to an address book management center to supply a request for the address book information”, recited in independent Claim 7, or “inputting an address book service number including a **characteristic number** allocated to a client who wants address book information to be provided to an address book management center to supply a request for the address book information”, as recited in independent Claim 10. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 7 and 10 are patentably distinct from *Lindquist* and *Miller*, and it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

With regard to Claim 12, as indicated above, this claim has been amended to include the recitation of a characteristic number. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 12 is patentably distinct from *Lindquist* and *Miller*, and it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

With regard to Claim 15, which has been rejected as being anticipated by *Molne*, as indicated above, Claim 15 has also been amended to include the recitation of a characteristic number. It is respectfully submitted that *Molne* does not teach searching a characteristic number as recited in Claim 15. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 12 is patentably distinct from *Molne*, and it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Based on the arguments presented above, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claims 7, 10, 12, 15, and 18 are in condition for allowance. Without conceding the patentability per se of the pending dependent claims, they are likewise believed to be allowable by virtue of their dependence on independent Claims 7, 10, 12, 15, and 18, respectively. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and objections of the dependent claims are respectfully requested.

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 2-18, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicant's attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Peter G. Dilworth". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Peter" and last name "Dilworth" clearly distinguishable.

Peter G. Dilworth

Reg. No. 26,450

Attorney for Applicant(s)

DILWORTH & BARRESE, LLP
333 Earle Ovington Blvd.
Uniondale, New York 11553
Tel: (516) 228-8484
Fax: (516) 228-8516

PGD/DMO/lah